

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/840,433 | YU ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Ian N. Moore | 2661 | |

All Participants:

(1) Ian N. Moore.

(2) Michael J. Turgeon.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 22 September 2005

Time: 11:56 AM

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

1-7, 11-14

Prior art documents discussed:


none

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Applicant agrees to replace "grade" with "fuzzy value" and "variance value" with "change" in accordance with the specification, and other are set forth in the examiner's amendment.

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)